

EIS001535

FROM: Daniel R. Romano, Co-coordinator
Gateway Green Alliance
4251 Castleman Ave.
St. Louis, MO 63110

TO: Wendy Dixon, EIS Manager
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office
North Las Vegas, Nevada

RECEIVED

FEB 16 2000

1 I cannot comment on the EIS because when I attended the DOE's hearings on Jan. 20, 2000 concerning shipping high level wastes to the Yucca Mountain site, the EIS was not there. I was told it was delayed in shipping. Kind of proves Murphy's Law, doesn't it?

This should be a warning to the DOE *against* shipping high level nuclear wastes across the country: "What can go wrong will go wrong and at the worst possible time." I was told at the Jan. 20th hearings that there was only a "one in ten million chance" of an accident that could threaten public health during the shipping of these nuclear wastes.

These kinds of risk assessments are based on assumptions and cannot be scientific. Which crystal ball did you pull your risk assessment out of? Before the accidents at nuclear power generating facilities (such as Three Mile Island, Browns Ferry and many others) the public was assured that the chances of harm to public health were extremely small.

2 Your risk assessment fails to adequately account for human error. Does it address the risks to the health
3 of workers filling, loading and unloading the casks filled with the irradiated wastes? Does it even address
4 the fact that, even in the best of circumstances, the casks will emit radiation that threatens human health
and the integrity of the surrounding environment? What will happen to the tremendous amount of
dangerous, so-called "low level wastes" that these nuclear power generating facilities generate?

5 I remind you that there is no threshold level for radioactive exposure to humans; even at the lowest levels, it adversely affects human health in a number of ways. Radiation not only causes cancer, it damages the immune system and the endocrine system and causes birth defects.

6 It is obvious that the real intent in shipping these wastes across the country is not to protect public health or to provide a secure place for these wastes. The real intent of this plan is to empty the spent fuel rod pools *so they can be filled up again*. The safest way to deal with these wastes is to leave them where they are and stop producing them. We should phase out nuclear power and switch to technologies that are proven safe and effective such as solar energy.

Sincerely,


Daniel R. Romano